

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

Submitted herewith please find 9 sheets of replacement drawings in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.84, which were previously submitted on October 16, 2006. The Examiner is respectfully requested to acknowledge receipt of these drawings.

The submitted drawings are intended to replace the drawings previously submitted on August 24, 2006.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets (9 sheets)

**REMARKS**

In the present Amendment, the abstract has been amended to shorten its length. Claims 2 and 5-9 have been amended to correct their dependency. Claims 3-4 and 10-14 have been cancelled without prejudice and disclaimer. New claims 15-24 have been added.

Claim 15 is a combination of original claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 8 and 9.

Claim 16 corresponds to original claim 3, but depends from claim 15.

Claim 17 corresponds to original claim 4, but depends from claim 16.

Claim 18 corresponds to original claims 11 and 12, but depends from claim 15 or 17.

Claim 19 corresponds to original claim 10, but depends from claim 15 or 17.

Claim 20 corresponds to original claims 11, 12 and 14, but depends from claim 15.

Claim 21 corresponds to original claim 14, but depends from claim 15 or 17.

Claim 22 corresponds to original claims 10 and 14, but depends from claim 15 or 17.

Claim 23 is a combination of original claims 1, 7, 10, 11 and 12.

Claim 24 corresponds to original claim 14, but depends from claim 23.

No new matter has been added, and entry of the Amendment is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the Amendment, claims 1-2, 5-9 and 15-24 will be pending.

As an initial matter, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to return a complete initialed copy of the Form PTO/SB/08 filed with Applicants' Disclosure Statement of August 24, 2006, indicating that all the references listed therein have been considered and made of record. The Examiner has not considered the non-U.S. patent documents disclosed in the IDS. However, Applicants have complied with the concise explanation requirement under 37 C.F.R. § 1.98(a)(3) for foreign language documents. See the IDS's filed August 24 and September 14, 2006.

In paragraph No. 1 of the Action, the Examiner requires new corrected drawings.

In response, Applicants submit that formal replacement drawings were submitted on October 16, 2006. Nonetheless, Applicants resubmit these drawings herewith for Examiner's convenience.

In paragraph No. 4 of the Action, the abstract of the disclosure is objected to for its length.

As noted, the abstract has been amended to address the Examiner's concern. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection of the abstract is respectfully requested.

In paragraph No. 5 of the Action, claims 6-14 are objected to as being in improper multiple dependent form.

As noted, the claims have been amended to correct their dependency. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to claims 6-14 is respectfully requested.

In paragraph No. 7 of the Action, claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Ohkawa (US 6,485,157).

Applicants submit that this rejection should be withdrawn because Ohkawa does not disclose or render obvious the light diffusing sheet of the present invention.

As to claim 1, Ohkawa discloses a light guide plate **30** made of a transparent material having a pair of major faces **34** and **35**. The face **34** is provided with a great number of micro-reflectors **90**. See col. 8, lines 22-26 and 30-33. The micro-reflector **90** has a shape like a block having four faces **91** through **94**. See col. 9, lines 52-53 and Figure 6. Ohkawa does not disclose or suggest a light diffusing sheet "having fine recesses formed in at least one of the surfaces thereof, the fine recesses having a shape which is any of the shape of an inverted polyangular pyramid, the shape of an inverted truncated polyangular pyramid, the shape of an inverted cone, and the shape of an inverted truncated cone" as recited in claim 1.

As to claim 2, the reflection member of a white PET film in Ohkawa (col. 8, lines 33-39) does not correspond to “a light diffusing agent” as recited in claim 2.

Further, the Examiner deems micro-reflectors **90** in Ohkawa as “a light-diffusing agent,” which she also employs as meeting “fine recesses” in claim 1. Applicants submit that micro-reflectors **90** in Ohkawa do not meet the limitation of “a light-diffusing agent” or “fine recesses” of the present claims.

Accordingly, the present claims are not taught or rendered obvious by Ohkawa.

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection based on Ohkawa are respectfully requested.

Allowance is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Hui C. Wauters  
Registration No. 57,426

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/265550

**65565**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: November 28, 2007